

[7th February 1925]

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—" I have no accurate knowledge of the supervision exercised by these labour officers. But as has been mentioned in clause (a) of the answer the desirability of appointing superintendents to inspect these schools under the orders of the Commissioner of Labour is under examination. We will then consider whether it will be possible to appoint superintendents who are qualified as educational advisers."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Will the hon. Member consider the desirability of placing these institutions also under the general supervision of the educational officers of the Education Department?"

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—" That point will be considered in connexion with the appointment of special superintendents which is under examination."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Will the hon. Member try the experiment of appointing honorary labour officers just like honorary registrars?"

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—" Does my hon. Friend refer to honorary labour officers appointed for this special purpose of inspecting the schools or for labour problems in general?"

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" All problems."

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—" Then I submit that this question does not arise out of the main question."

Leave Rules.

Subsidiary Leave Rules to Fundamental Leave Rules.

* 206 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) when the Subsidiary Leave Rules to the Fundamental Leave Rules published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 6th December 1921, were issued by the local Government and from what date the Fundamental Leave Rules were brought into force;

(b) whether any changes were made in the Fundamental Leave Rules after the publication of the Subsidiary Leave Rules in the *Fort St. George Gazette* and if so, under what authority changes were brought about in the original leave rules;

(c) whether the consent of the Government servants was obtained to remain under the old or the new leave rules before the Fundamental Leave Rules were brought into force;

(d) whether the Government are aware that the changes made in the Fundamental Leave Rules Nos. 81 and 87 and published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 2nd January 1923 and 2nd December 1924, have adversely affected Government servants drawing less than Rs. 300;

(e) the precautions taken by the Government to guard the interests of such of the Government servants as have already elected to come under the Fundamental Leave Rules; and

(f) why the concessions originally granted by the Secretary of State are now withdrawn and why the changes are not made to operate on new entrants only?

7th February 1925]

A.—(a) Subsidiary rules to the Fundamental Rules were issued by the Local Government on the 6th November 1922. The Fundamental Rules came into force with effect from 1st January 1922.

(b) There have been some changes. They were made by the Secretary of State in Council under the powers conferred by section 96-B of the Government of India Act.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) When Rule 81 was amended, Government servants who had elected to come under the Fundamental Rules were again allowed the option of reverting to the leave rules by which they were previously governed.

(f) The amendment of Fundamental Rule 81 was introduced to correct a mistake that had been overlooked when the rules were originally issued. The Government are unaware of the reasons for the recent amendment of Fundamental Rule 87.

Village Establishments.

Duties of village servants, talaiyaris, etc.

* 207 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the village servants, talaiyaris and vettians are bound to serve both the village munsif and the karnam;

(b) whether they are under the control of both of them; and

(c) if so, how their services are divided between the two officers?

A.—(a) & (b) The vetti and talaiyari are under the control of the head of the village. They must obey the karnam if deputed for work under him.

(c) Subject to any orders of competent superior authority, this is a matter for the headman to arrange with due regard to the needs of the village.

Mr. R. SRINIVASAN:—“Referring to answer (c) where it is stated ‘to arrange with due regard to the needs of the village,’ may I know whether it includes sanitary arrangements also?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“I want notice of that question.”

Village munsifs in the Tinnevelly district.

* 208 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that all the Nadar village munsifs have lost their seats during the revision of villages in the Tinnevelly district;

(b) whether any petition concerning the matter has been submitted to the Government; and

(c) if so, whether the Government have taken any action on the petition?

A.—(a) The Government have no reason to think so.

(b) & (c) No such petition has been received.